

reappear. Politics is without a rational, ideological and utopian emphasis an activity resolving only those life problems which cannot be resolved otherwise. This is the message of this part of the book.

IV. Methodological experiences. In this part of the book the author states his own positions. Contrary to the introduction, in this part it is the semantics of political processes that is in the focus and not autopoiesis and hermeneutics of speech and writing. The conclusions do not fulfill the promises made in the introduction. Such an outcome suggests that the author was not writing the book as a German would, knowing in advance its beginning and end, but more like a Frenchman who never knows how to finish what he started. In defense of the author we might put it like this: the message of the book would gain intensity if the book started with the fourth part and ended with the first. However, is it an objection, advice, or an impression? Is the book aimed at general readership or experts? Those who know will easily understand what they have gained, and those who do not should wait for further explanations by the author. The author is still alive and lives in Zagreb.

We witnessed the progress of the here presented book and we have already stated our major objections within our small scientific community. As far as we can see, the author has accepted most of the objections, and therefore, we are pleased to recommend this book which can help its readers gain substantial insight into political debates in Croatia at the turn of the 20th century. Rodin is a reliable witness to these debates.

Zvonko Posavec

Translated by  
Mirna Varlandy-Supek

Vladimir Vujčić

*Politička tolerancija*  
(*Political Tolerance*)

Defimi, Zagreb 1995, 186 pages

The year 1995 was the UN "Year of Tolerance". The rationale for that was the fact that there is no democracy without tolerance and that huge human efforts must go towards increasing tolerance.

The research of political tolerance has been motivated by its significance for democracy which cannot function properly without the political consensus on major social issues and without political tolerance. For theoreticians of liberalism, political tolerance is even more important for democracy than political consensus since it is linked with the question of social power and the question of a peaceful resolution of social conflicts.

The importance of tolerance has brought about the development of the theory of tolerance (analogous to the theory of freedom or the theory of democracy, etc.) which has been trying to explain the essence and the meaning of tolerance. The major debates on tolerance today focus on the question whether tolerance is the final (target) value (a value which determines the meaning of human existence) or only an instrumental value meant as a means of realizing certain ultimate human values.

In this study Vladimir Vujčić does not investigate the importance of tolerance for democracy and different opinions about that matter, but offers a comprehensive review of various issues related to tolerance. For example,

he expostulates on the subject of tolerance and points out that the object of tolerance are "not solely human beliefs but the proponents of those beliefs (social and political groups) as well as their activities." This means that the political tolerance of individuals belonging to a certain group does not depend solely on the content of tolerance but on the group itself as the object of tolerance and its activities.

The author goes on to stress that tolerance cannot only be attitudinal, otherwise how to explain that we can have a negative attitude towards a social group and yet behave towards it in a tolerant manner. The recognition of this fact opened the door to more accurate empirical research of political tolerance.

The afore mentioned can lead us to the conclusion that political tolerance means the recognition of the right to dissimilarity. However, dissimilarity is the prerequisite for tolerance and not its main content. If there were no differences and negative attitudes to them, there would be no need for tolerance. However, repugnance based on differences may breed indifference or even conformism in our behaviour. Indifferent and conformist behaviour does not necessarily imply tolerant behaviour. Tolerant behaviour implies "sufferance or forbearance of the differences we otherwise feel repugnance to." That is why tolerance includes the term "threshold of endurance" which often cannot and should not be overstepped. It should be noted, however, that tolerance is not only passive "sufferance" but also active assessment of the content of tolerance and the right to dissimilarity. That is why tolerance should not be seen as a pre-established rule but as "readiness for assessment and sufferance in the implementation of political freedoms and moral principles in a society, valid for all and each. Thus

tolerance is a very complex psychological state which cannot be regulated by rules but can and must be value-oriented. Tolerance can be developed solely by means of education, i.e. by means of political socialization and education of the youth and the citizens in general."

Inspired by the development of the theory of tolerance and the research in the world, Vladimir Vujčić conducted an empirical research of tolerance in Croatia. The studies abroad and in Croatia have showed there is a strong correlation between tolerance and democracy. The main contents of political tolerance are freedom of speech, public gathering, political association and organization. These are the basic freedoms related to the right to political opposition and its unimpeded functioning.

Empirical research have shown that tolerance is not the target but instrumental value, which means that it must be rooted in the value system, which, in turn, means that people should be educated for tolerance. Tolerance cannot and should not be promoted through the education of the youth as a dogma or a norm. It must be present in their education, but as an instrumental value whose aim is the realization of some existential values of societies and individuals (freedom, equality, dissimilarity, peace and security, self-respect, etc.) These are only some of the researched issues. It must be pointed out that the research on tolerance, described in this work, is exceptionally complex and extensive. According to the author, "tolerance is a multi-layered phenomenon, but its complexity does not ensue from itself but from the conditions determining it". Tolerance is multi-dimensional and has a complex structure. The value of this research is in the fact that by means of its findings we can rather reliably predict the conditions in which tolerance or intolerance occur. For ex-

ample, if "the conditions such as non-authoritarianism of individuals and the respect (support) for the universal norms of democracy and civil liberties are combined, then it is very likely that a person is to demonstrate a high degree of tolerance, that they will show tendency towards a universal tolerance or tolerance as a personal characteristic."

The author compares the results obtained abroad and in Croatia. They are mostly similar, but there are also certain differences which the author attributes to the differences in the political context and the fact that the Croatian research was conducted during the Serbian aggression on Croatia. However, the results also prove that Croatian youth is quite ready for the "realization of the political freedoms of citizens which will guarantee a stable and dynamic development of democracy in the Croatian society."

Vladimir Vujčić's book is a valuable contribution to the research concerning political tolerance and the development of democracy. As such it is a very interesting reading for researchers as well as for educators since the understanding of the problem of tolerance is exceptionally significant for the education of young people.

Vlatko Cvrtila

Translated by  
Božica Jakovlev

## Book review

Ivan Grdešić

### *Političko odlučivanje* (*Political Decision-Making*)

Alinea, Zagreb, 1995, 137 pages

In 1951, Harold Laswell invited all social and other scientists to join their efforts in the pooling of knowledge about society and for society. Using the term policy sciences, he founded what is today called policy analysis. He thought that the new scientific orientation should embrace the most important decisions in the society and apply the interdisciplinary approach to their study. Laswell's plea coincided with the ascent of the post-behaviorist approach in political science which opened the door to the thematization of social problems, while political scientists began to devote attention not only to political processes but to their results and consequences as well.

Ivan Grdešić's book, *Political Decision-Making*, his first solo effort, is also the first integral response of one Croatian political scientist to Laswell's call for the need of the creation of policy-knowledge. The author, Assistant Professor at the Faculty of Political Sciences in Zagreb, has for many years been doing policy-analysis and pointing out the significance of policy-orientation for political science. Although the influence of policy-approach can be noticed in other sciences, it is an undeniable fact that policy-analysis is most strongly tied to political science, within which it has become a separate research discipline.

The book in front of us gives a detailed review of the development of policy-analysis and its role in contemporary political science. The book is